

REMARKS

Claims 11-42 were previously pending in the application. Claims 11-42 remain unchanged. Claims 11, 24, 30, and 37 are independent.

Entry of this Response is proper because it does not raise any new issues requiring further search by the Examiner, narrows the issues on appeal, and is believed to place the present application in condition for immediate allowance.

Allowed Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Office Action's indication that claims 24-42 are allowed.

The Claimed Invention

An exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention, as recited by, for example, independent claim 11, is directed to a dishwasher comprising a spray device for spraying rinsing liquid into the interior of the rinsing container, the spray device including at least one spray channel for guiding a rinsing liquid and at least one distributor for regulating the supply of rinsing liquid to the at least one spray channel, the at least one spray channel having, on a side directed towards the interior of the rinsing container, openings for the passage therethrough of the rinsing liquid and having two open ends via which rinsing liquid can be supplied in a pressurised manner.

Many conventional dishwashers include spray devices which operate with rotating spray arms. In many cases, the corner areas of the rinsing container are not adequately sprayed with rinsing liquid by the rotating spray arms, since the rotating spray arms have a circular range of action, while the rinsing container commonly is rectangular. Moreover, items to be washed in the dishwasher can interfere with the rotating spray arms, thereby limiting operation of the dishwasher, the arrangement of items in the dishwasher, and the use of space within the dishwasher. Such spray devices commonly produce only uniform spray jets which may be insufficient to adequately clean the items to be rinsed.

In stark contrast, the present invention provides a dishwasher with a space-saving spray device that has no moving spray arms, thereby minimizing breakdowns associated with such

moving parts, eliminating interference between the spray device and the arrangement of items in the dishwasher, and improving the use of space within the dishwasher.

The present invention also provides a spray device in which the rinsing liquid is sprayed in the rinsing container as uniformly as possible to efficiently act upon the items to be rinsed with rinsing liquid, can produce variable spray jets in order to improve the cleaning effect of the items to be rinsed, and can provide different spray patterns. Moreover, the present invention provides a spray device that can be configured in almost any shape to correspond to any shape of the rinsing container, as well as on one or more of the bottom, sides, and top of the rinsing container. See, e.g., page 1, lines 25-29; page 2, lines 13-32; page 3, lines 1-9; and page 5, lines 13-18.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11, 14, 18, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lutolf reference (FR2285838), the Van Dijk reference (U.S. Patent No. 2,654,894), and the Steen reference (GB 949954). Claims 12, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lutolf reference, the Van Dijk reference, the Steen reference, and the Bolla reference (CH571852). Claims 12, 13, 16, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lutolf reference, the Van Dijk reference, the Steen reference, the Perry reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,003,529), and the Deuser et al. reference (UK Patent Application Publication No. 2003840). Claims 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lutolf reference, the Van Dijk reference, the Steen reference, the Perry reference, the Deuser et al. reference, and the Hamilton reference (U.S. Patent No. 3,512,539). Claims 11-16 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Bolla reference in view of the Steen reference.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

To summarize, the present Office Action relies on:

- (1) the Lutolf reference for allegedly teaching a dishwasher having spray channels allegedly having two open ends;

(2) the Van Dijk reference for allegedly teaching a distributor (valves 48, 53) that can be opened and closed to provide surges of liquid;

(3) the Steen reference for allegedly teaching feeding liquid from both sides of the spray channel and towards each other so that they collide at a lateral spray point;

(4) the Bolla reference for allegedly teaching a rotating distributor 8 that supplies liquid to spray channels;

(5) the Perry reference for teaching a plate-type distributor (valve 40 having a slide plate 50 that moves in a slot 48 to change the size of the orifice 44) that allegedly is movable in alternating directions;

(6) the Deuser et al reference for the motivation for alternating spray patterns for washing 3-D objects such as containers;

(7) the Hamilton reference for teaching a drive means having a drive slot 105 driven by a rotary disk (crank wheel 99) and a cam (pin 101) arranged on the rotary disk and engaging the drive slot 105 to cause movement; and

(8) the Mahoney reference for teaching multiple spray channels in the bottom of the rinsing container (Fig. 2).

The Rejection over the Lutolf reference, the Van Dijk reference, and in view of the Steen reference.

Claims 11, 14, 18, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lutolf reference, the Van Dijk reference, and in view of the Steen reference.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

None of the applied references, either individually or in combination, discloses or suggests the features of the claimed invention including a spray device including at least one spray channel for guiding a rinsing liquid and at least one distributor for regulating the supply of rinsing liquid to the at least one spray channel, the at least one spray channel having, on a side directed towards the interior of the rinsing container, openings for the passage therethrough of the rinsing liquid and having two open ends via which rinsing liquid can be supplied in a pressurised manner, as recited by independent claim 11. Moreover, none of the

applied references, either individually or in combination, discloses or suggests the features of at least dependent claims 14, 18, 19, and 21.

These features are important for providing a space-saving spray device that has no moving spray arms, thereby minimizing breakdowns associated with such moving parts, eliminating interference between the spray device and the arrangement of items in the dishwasher, and improving the use of space within the dishwasher, while also providing uniform spraying, producing variable spray jets and different spray patterns, and providing a spray device that can be configured in almost any shape to correspond to any shape of the rinsing container. See, e.g., page 1, lines 25-29; page 2, lines 13-32; page 3, lines 1-9; and page 5, lines 13-18.

The Office Action alleges that the Lutolf reference discloses distributors 80, 60, and that the pressure allegedly is variable by means of the distributors 80, 60.

Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, the Lutolf reference very clearly does not disclose these features. Indeed, the Lutolf reference very clearly fails to disclose at least one distributor for regulating the supply of rinsing liquid to the at least one spray channel, as recited in claim 11. Moreover, the Lutolf reference very clearly fails to disclose that the pressure is variable by means of the check valves 60, 80, which are compared to the claimed distributor.

Instead, as shown in the Figure, the Lutolf reference discloses check valves or one-way valves 60, 80, which simply allow flow in a single direction. Based on a computer translation of the Lutolf reference obtained from the European Patent Office web site, the valve symbols used for 60, 80 in the Figure are consistent with the description of the Lutolf reference, which describes that the liquid flows only from pipes 55 and 77 through check valves 60, 80 respectively toward the shower pipes 3.

A “*check valve*” is defined as “a valve that permits flow in one direction only” by Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2011, Merriam-Webster Online, 05 January 2011, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/check+valve>.

Thus, contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, the check valves 60, 80 of the Lutolf reference do not regulate the supply of rinsing liquid to the spray channel. Rather, the check valves 60, 80 permit the rinsing liquid to be supplied unimpeded or unregulated into the

pipe system 3 *in the supply direction*. The check valves 60, 80, by definition, simply restrict flow back from, or out of, the pipe system 3 toward the pipes 55 and 77, respectively (i.e., the reverse flow direction or return flow direction, not the supply direction).

The Lutolf reference clearly does not disclose that the pressure at which the rinsing liquid is supplied to the spray channel is variable. Indeed, the check valves 60, 80 are not capable of varying the pressure of the rinsing liquid. Absent the addition of some other device, the check valves 60, 80 themselves do not, and cannot, vary the pressure in the spray channels. Hence, the check valves 60, 80 do not disclose a distributor as claimed.

Moreover, independent claim 11 recites the at least one spray channel [...] having two open ends via which rinsing liquid can be supplied in a pressurised manner. Claim 11 positively defines the physical structure of the spray channel as having two open ends.

The Lutolf reference very clearly fails to disclose a spray channel having two open ends, as claimed.

Instead, as shown in the Figure, the Lutolf reference discloses a closed system of spray channels 3. The ends of the spray channels 3 are not open. Rather, the ends of the spray channel 3 are fixed to the check valves or one-way valves 60, 80. Hence, the Lutolf reference does not render obvious the features of claim 11.

The Response to Arguments asserts that Applicants have failed to amend the original claims and the language of the claims are extremely broad. Applicants note, however, that there is absolutely nothing wrong with a claim being “broad” so long as the claim does not read on the prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103. For the reasons set forth above, Applicants submit that the claims are not anticipated by, or rendered obvious from, the prior art of record.

Alternative Rejection:

In the alternative to the rejection above, the Office Action alleges that, if the Lutolf reference does not teach that the check valves (60)(80) cooperate to regulate the flow of liquid to the spray channels, then the Van Dijk reference makes up for the deficiencies by allegedly teaching a cleaning device (a foot bath) in which a conduit (20) is supplied at each end by an alleged distributor (compared to valves 48 & 53), Fig. 1. The Office Action alleges that the Van Dijk reference teaches that “the degree of turbulence of the liquid may be increased by

opening both valves 48 and 53, or they (either of them) may be rhythmatically opened and closed to provide surges of liquid" (Column 4, Lines 59-64).

Applicants respectfully submit that neither the Van Dijk reference nor the Steen reference makes up for the deficiencies of the Lutolf reference. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have had an apparent reason to combine the disclosure of the Lutolf reference with the disclosure of the Van Dijk reference and/or the Steen reference to arrive at the claimed invention as a whole.

The Van Dijk reference has valves 48 and 53 that are manually controlled by an occupant or attendant to supply liquid to the foot bath. One of ordinary skill in the art of dishwashers would not have been motivated by the manual opening and closing of valves of a foot bath to regulate the supply of washing liquid in a dishwasher. Indeed, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that, in stark contrast to a foot bath, it would be entirely impractical to manually open and close valves during a washing cycle of a dishwasher in order to regulate the supply of washing liquid to the items to be rinsed.

Indeed, the Response to Arguments specifically acknowledges that "[i]t is just as impractical to manually operate valves on a foot bath as on a dishwashing machine." See Office Action at page 3. However, the Van Dijk reference does just that; valves 48 and 53 are manually controlled by an occupant or attendant to supply liquid to the foot bath. See, e.g., col. 4, lines 24-25 and 59-63.

Hence, when properly considered as a whole, the Van Dijk reference teaches manual operation of a foot bath. The teachings of the Van Dijk reference have absolutely nothing to do with a dishwasher and would be entirely impractical for use in a dishwasher. Indeed, as the Office Action acknowledges, it would be entirely impractical to manually operate valves on a dishwashing machine, as taught by the Van Dijk reference.

The Response to Arguments asserts that the fundamental principle [taught by the Van Dijk reference] is that surges of liquid can be produced by opening the valves. See, Office Action at page 3. Applicants submit, however, that the Office Action appears to be improperly distilling the invention down to a gist of the invention, rather than considering the claimed invention as whole.

M.P.E.P. § 2141.02 (I) states that, in determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. M.P.E.P. § 2141.02 (II) states that, distilling an invention down to the "gist" or "thrust" of an invention disregards the requirement of analyzing the subject matter "as a whole."

The present invention is not simply that surges of liquid can be produced by opening valves, irrespective of how such is accomplished. Rather, the present invention provides a space-saving spray device (as defined by the claims) that has no moving spray arms, thereby minimizing breakdowns associated with such moving parts, eliminating interference between the spray device and the arrangement of items in the dishwasher, and improving the use of space within the dishwasher, while also providing uniform spraying, producing variable spray jets and different spray patterns, and providing a spray device that can be configured in almost any shape to correspond to any shape of the rinsing container. See, e.g., page 1, lines 25-29; page 2, lines 13-32; page 3, lines 1-9; and page 5, lines 13-18.

Hence, when properly considered as a whole, the manual operation of valves of a foot bath to provide surges of liquid in the foot bath, as taught by the Van Dijck reference, has absolutely nothing to do with a dishwasher, and its teachings would be entirely impractical for use in a dishwasher. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art clearly would not have had an apparent reason to combine these references in the manner alleged to arrive at the claimed invention.

Moreover, Applicants submit that the Office Action does not establish an adequate rationale for making such a combination *to arrive at the claimed invention*. That is, the stated rationale in the Office Action "to create a washing machine in which there is fine control of the pulsing of the spray -- which is especially useful in a system with a stationary spray system -- to effectively wash the dishes and achieve the expected result" is not believed to be adequate to establish a reasonable basis for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references in the manner alleged *to arrive at the claimed invention*.

Rather, based on the stated rationale, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the references to arrive at the teachings of the Steen reference, which provides fine

control of the angle of spread covered by the spray. See, e.g., page 1, lines 47-51. The stated rationale does not provide any apparent reason to further provide the inventive features of the claimed invention which provides a spray device including at least one spray channel for guiding a rinsing liquid and at least one distributor for regulating the supply of rinsing liquid to the at least one spray channel, the at least one spray channel having, on a side directed towards the interior of the rinsing container, openings for the passage therethrough of the rinsing liquid and having two open ends via which rinsing liquid can be supplied in a pressurised manner, as recited by independent claim 11. As explained above, these features are important for providing a space-saving spray device that has no moving spray arms, thereby minimizing breakdowns associated with such moving parts, eliminating interference between the spray device and the arrangement of items in the dishwasher, and improving the use of space within the dishwasher, while also providing uniform spraying, producing variable spray jets and different spray patterns, and providing a spray device that can be configured in almost any shape to correspond to any shape of the rinsing container. See, e.g., page 1, lines 25-29; page 2, lines 13-32; page 3, lines 1-9; and page 5, lines 13-18.

For at least the foregoing reasons, none of the applied references discloses or suggests the subject matter defined by claims 11, 14, 18, 19, and 21.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Rejection over the Lutolf reference, the Van Dijk reference, the Steen reference, and the Bolla reference.

Claims 12, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lutolf reference, the Van Dijk reference, the Steen reference, and further in view of the Bolla reference.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For the reasons set forth above, neither the Van Dijk reference or the Steen reference makes up for the deficiencies of the Lutolf reference with respect to independent claim 11, and one or ordinary skill in the art would not have had an apparent reason to combine these references in the manner alleged to arrive at the claimed invention.

The Bolla reference also fails to make up for the deficiencies of these references. Regarding the Bolla reference, the Office Action makes the conclusory statement that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Lutolf reference with the Bolla reference to create a washing machine in which there is fine control of the pulsing of the spray -- which is especially useful in a system with a stationary spray system -- to effectively wash the dishes and achieve the expected result.” The Office Action fails to provide any support for these conclusions.

Similar to the rejection above, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action does not establish an adequate rationale for making such a combination *to arrive at the claimed invention*. Rather, based on the stated rationale, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the references to arrive at the teachings of the Steen reference, which provides fine control of the angle of spread covered by the spray. See, e.g., page 1, lines 47-51. The stated rationale does not provide any apparent reason to further provide the inventive features of the claimed invention which provides a spray device including at least one spray channel for guiding a rinsing liquid and at least one distributor for regulating the supply of rinsing liquid to the at least one spray channel, the at least one spray channel having, on a side directed towards the interior of the rinsing container, openings for the passage therethrough of the rinsing liquid and having two open ends via which rinsing liquid can be supplied in a pressurised manner, as recited by independent claim 11. As explained above, these features are important for providing a space-saving spray device that has no moving spray arms, thereby minimizing breakdowns associated with such moving parts, eliminating interference between the spray device and the arrangement of items in the dishwasher, and improving the use of space within the dishwasher, while also providing uniform spraying, producing variable spray jets and different spray patterns, and providing a spray device that can be configured in almost any shape to correspond to any shape of the rinsing container. See, e.g., page 1, lines 25-29; page 2, lines 13-32; page 3, lines 1-9; and page 5, lines 13-18.

Applicants respectfully submit that such conclusory statements are insufficient to provide a prima facie case for obviousness because the Office Action fails to provide an adequate rationale for modifying the prior art as required by *KSR International v. Teleflex Inc.* 82 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1385 (2007). “[R]jections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by

mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rationale underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." (In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (CA Fed. 2006) cited with approval in KSR).

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to present a prima facie case for obviousness.

Even assuming in arguendo that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the alleged combination, the Bolla reference does not make up for the deficiencies of the alleged combination of the applied references.

Particularly, none of the applied references, including the Bolla reference, discloses or suggests wherein the at least one distributor is mounted to be movable relative to the at least one spray channel in a selected one of a to-and-fro displacement movement in alternating directions and a movement that is not a to-and-fro displacement movement in alternating directions, as recited in claim 12. The obviousness of the specific features recited in the claims cannot be established merely by a general assertion that the prior art teaches varying spray patterns absent some showing that the actual claimed features are disclosed by, or rendered obvious from, the prior art.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the stated rationale in the Office Action fails articulated a reasonable basis for modifying the Lutolf reference *to arrive at the claimed invention*, in which the at least one distributor is mounted to be movable relative to the at least one spray channel in a selected one of a to-and-fro displacement movement in alternating directions and a movement that is not a to-and-fro displacement movement in alternating directions, as recited in claim 12.

Claim 13 recites the arrangement of the at least one opening of the at least one distributor and an open end of the spray channel, which also clearly is not disclosed or rendered obvious from the applied references or prior art in general.

Claim 16 recites drive means for driving the at least one distributor in a periodic movement. The Office Action asserts that the Bolla reference discloses a drive means for driving the distributor in periodic movement, but does not cite any support or provide an explanation for this assertion. Hence, the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case at least with respect to claim 16.

For at least the foregoing reasons, none of the applied references discloses or suggests the subject matter defined by claims 12, 13, and 16.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Rejection over the Lutolf reference, the Van Dijk reference, the Steen reference, the Perry reference, and the Deuser et al. reference

Claims 12, 13, 16, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lutolf reference, the Van Dijk reference, the Steen reference, the Perry reference, and further in view of the Deuser et al. reference.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For the reasons set forth above, neither the Van Dijk reference or the Steen reference makes up for the deficiencies of the Lutolf reference with respect to independent claim 11, and one or ordinary skill in the art would not have had an apparent reason to combine these references in the manner alleged to arrive at the claimed invention.

The Perry reference and the Deuser et al. reference also fail to make up for the deficiencies of these references.

Alternative Rejection:

In the alternative to the above, the Office Action acknowledges that the Lutolf reference, as modified by the Van Dijk reference and the Steen reference does not teach the to-and-fro movement of the distributor in alternating directions and the drive means. However, the Office Action alleges that the Perry reference teaches a plate-type distributor (valve 40) which is movable related to the spray channel in a displacement movement in alternating directions, Fig. 2, that there allegedly is a drive means for driving the distributor in periodic movement, and that it allegedly would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lutolf as modified by Van Dijk as modified by Steen with Perry to create a dishwashing machine with an alternating spray pattern to achieve the expected result. The Office Action fails to provide any support for these conclusions.

Similar to the rejections above, Applicants respectfully submit that such conclusory statements are insufficient to provide a prima facie case for obviousness because the Office

Action fails to provide an adequate rationale for modifying the prior art as required by *KSR International v. Teleflex Inc.* 82 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1385 (2007).

As explained in the response to the rejection above, Applicants respectfully submit that the stated rationale does not provide any apparent reason to further provide the inventive features *of the claimed invention* which provides a spray device including at least one spray channel for guiding a rinsing liquid and at least one distributor for regulating the supply of rinsing liquid to the at least one spray channel, the at least one spray channel having, on a side directed towards the interior of the rinsing container, openings for the passage therethrough of the rinsing liquid and having two open ends via which rinsing liquid can be supplied in a pressurised manner, as recited by independent claim 11.

Even assuming in arguendo that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the alleged combination, the Perry reference does not make up for the deficiencies of the alleged combination of the applied references.

Particularly, none of the applied references, including the Perry reference, discloses or suggests that the distributor is mounted to be movable relative to the at least one spray channel in a selected one of a to-and-fro displacement *movement* in alternating directions and *a movement* that is not a to-and-fro displacement *movement* in alternating directions, as recited in claim 12.

In stark contrast to the claimed invention, the Perry reference simply discloses a stationary valve 40 having a part (i.e., the slide plate 50) that reciprocates in a stationary slot 48 to control the flow rate of the water into the manifold. See, e.g., Perry at col. 2, lines 32-56. The valve 40 itself clearly does not move.

Thus, the valve 40 of the Perry reference is NOT mounted to be movable relative to the at least one spray channel in a selected one of a to-and-fro displacement movement in alternating directions and a movement that is not a to-and-fro displacement movement in alternating directions, as recited in claim 12. Rather, the valve itself is stationary and only the slide plate 50 is moveable.

The Response to Arguments asserts that:

“the claim language of the distributor being movable in a selected one of a to-and-fro displacement and not a to-and-fro displacement simply permits the option of a movement of a non to-and-fro displacement,

only. The applicant's arguments that the Perry reference simply discloses a stationary valve having a slide plate that reciprocates in the slot is "NOT mounted to be movable in a selected one of a to-and-fro movement in alternating directions" is not understood. Examiner states that the slot reciprocates, thus a to-and-fro movement."
Emphasis added Applicants.

Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, the slot 48 of the valve 40 clearly does not reciprocate. Instead, the slot 48 is entirely stationary. The Perry reference only discloses that a part or component (i.e., the slide plate 50) of the stationary valve 40 reciprocates in the stationary slot 48 to vary the size of the opening formed by the plate 50 and the stationary slot 48 of the stationary valve 40 to be completely opened, completely closed, or to provide any size opening therebetween. See, e.g., Perry at col. 2, lines 32-56.

Thus, the Perry reference simply discloses **a stationary valve 40** having a part (i.e., the slide plate 50) that reciprocates in a stationary slot 48 to control the flow rate of the water through the opening formed by the plate 50 and the slot 48 into the manifold. See, e.g., Perry at col. 2, lines 32-56. The valve 40 itself clearly does not move, nor is the valve itself mounted to be movable relative to the orifice 44 in a selected one of a to-and-fro displacement movement in alternating directions and a movement that is not a to-and-fro displacement movement in alternating directions, as recited in claim 12. Rather, the valve itself is stationary and only a part of the valve (i.e., the slide plate 50) is moveable.

In comparison, independent claim 12 clearly recites that ***the distributor is mounted to be movable relative to the at least one spray channel*** in a selected one of a to-and-fro displacement movement in alternating directions and a movement that is not a to-and-fro displacement movement in alternating directions, not that a part of the distributor is mounted to be movable.

Hence, the Perry reference does not make up for the deficiencies of the alleged combination of the applied references with respect to claims 12, 13, 16, and 22.

For at least the foregoing reasons, none of the applied references discloses or suggests the subject matter defined by claims 12, 13, 16, and 22.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Rejection over the Lutolf reference, the Van Dijk reference, the Steen reference, the Perry reference, the Deuser et al. reference, and the Hamilton reference

Claims 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lutolf reference, the Van Dijk reference, the Steen reference, the Perry reference, the Deuser et al. reference, and the Hamilton reference.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For the same reasons as independent claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that neither the Van Dijk reference, the Steen reference, the Perry reference, the Deuser et al. reference, nor the Hamilton reference makes up for the deficiencies of the Lutolf reference. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have had an apparent reason to combine these references in the manner alleged to arrive at the claimed invention.

Thus, claims 17 and 23 are patentable over the applied reference for the same reasons as independent claim 11, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied references discloses or suggests the subject matter defined by claims 17 and 23.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Rejection over the Bolla reference and the Steen reference

Claims 11-16 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Bolla reference in view of the Steen reference.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to independent claim 11, none of the applied references, either individually or in combination, discloses or suggests the features of the claimed invention including at least one spray channel for guiding a rinsing liquid and at least one distributor for regulating the supply of rinsing liquid to the at least one spray channel, the at least one spray channel having, on a side directed towards the interior of the rinsing container, openings for the passage therethrough of the rinsing liquid and having two open ends via which rinsing liquid can be supplied in a

pressurised manner, as recited by independent claim 11. Moreover, none of the applied references, either individually or in combination, discloses or suggests the features of at least dependent claims 12-16 and 18-21.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, entry of the present Amendment and allowance of claims 11-42 are respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned. If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Respectfully submitted,

/Andre Pallapies/

Andre Pallapies
Registration No. 62,246
January 7, 2011

BSH Home Appliances Corporation
100 Bosch Boulevard
New Bern, NC 28562
Phone: 252-672-7927
Fax: 714-845-2807
andre.pallapies@bshg.com